



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,762	10/06/2000	William Y. Hall	BLBV-25,378	1640

25883 7590 10/06/2003

HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P
P.O. BOX 741715
DALLAS, TX 75374-1715

EXAMINER

HAQ, NAEEM U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,762

Applicant(s)

HALL ET AL.

Examiner

Naeem Haq

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

New corrected drawings are required because this application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance. Also see PTO-948 for additional information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "proximate" in claim 8 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "proximate" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leatherman et al (US Patent 5,734,851) in view Finley et al (US Patent 6,442,448 B1) and further in view of Thayer et al (US Patent 5,554,912) and Official Notice .

Leatherman teaches a fuel dispenser advertising system, comprising:

- one or more fuel dispensers operable to dispense fuel (Figure 1, item "12"; column 4, lines 30-35);
- a display subassembly associated with each of said one or more fuel dispensers for presenting information to a customer (Figure 2, item "125"; column 5, lines 23-36);
- a master interface system for transmitting said information to each said display subassembly (Figure 1, item "16"; column 4, lines 30-35);
- wherein each display subassembly comprises an electronic display for presenting audio and video information (column 1, lines 51-55);
- wherein said display is a liquid crystal display (column 5, lines 61-65);

Leatherman does not teach that the master interface system transmits information wirelessly to each display subassembly. However, Official Notice is taken that it is old

Art Unit: 3625

and well known in the art to transmit data wirelessly. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate wireless features into the system of the prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to avoid having to run data cables to each dispenser. Leatherman also does not teach that the master interface system logs into a central office system to download updates of said information, or that the subassembly comprises a coupon dispenser. However, Finley teaches these limitations (column 8, lines 1-27; column 25, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Finley into the system of Leatherman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide routine updates and coupons to customers as taught by Finley. Leatherman and Finley do not teach that the system downloads only information which is different than said information already stored on said master interface system. However, Official Notice is taken that the use of cache memory in performing updates is old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate cache memory into the system of the prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conserve bandwidth by performing updates only when the information on the central system changed. Leatherman and Finley also do not teach that the master interface system is located proximate to said fuel dispensers, or that the master interface system is physically mated to one or more fuel dispensers. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been

Art Unit: 3625

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to relocate the master interface system to a more convenient location. Applicant has not disclosed that relocation of the master interface system provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the master interface system located in a central location because the particular location of the master interface system would not affect the overall system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cited prior art to obtain the invention as specified in claims. Finally, Leatherman does not teach automatically adjusting the brightness of the electronic display in accordance with ambient light conditions. However, Thayer teaches this limitation (Abstract; column 1, line 1 – column 2, line 67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Thayer into the system of Leatherman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow a user to view the display screen in all ambient light conditions, as taught by Thayer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naeem Haq whose telephone number is (703)-305-3930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 3625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on (703)-308-1344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-1113.



Naeem Haq, Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3625

September 29, 2003



WYNN W. COGGINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600